

has been amended to directly depend from claim 5 rather than from claim 4. Claim 11 has been amended to show that the composition is in the form of a concentrate. Claim 13 has been amended to show that the boiling point is that of the fluorinated solvent. Thus, no new matter has been added by any of these amendments.

Specification

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner states that the term "as" should be "a", on page 3, line 15, of the specification. In response, Applicant has amended the specification as helpfully suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

On pages 2-3, in numbered paragraph 3, of the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 4, 6, 7, 11 and 13 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In the first part of this rejection, the Examiner states that claim 4 contains the term "fluorinated" which appears to be misspelled. In response, Applicant has corrected the spelling of "fluorinated" in claim 4. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that this part of the

rejection be withdrawn and that claim 4, as amended, be allowed.

In the second part of this rejection, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "fluorinated hydrocarbon" in line 2 of claim 6. In response, Applicant has amended claim 6 to directly depend from claim 5 rather than from claim 4, thereby providing the necessary antecedent basis for "fluorinated hydrocarbon." In view of this amendment, it is respectfully requested that this part of the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 6, as amended, be allowed.

In the third part of this rejection, the Examiner states that the term "with" is misspelled in claim 7. In response, Applicant has corrected the spelling of "with" in claim 7. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that this part of the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 7, as amended, be allowed.

In the fourth part of this rejection, it is the position of the Examiner that the manner in which claim 11 is written is unclear. In response, Applicant has amended claim 11 to show that the composition is in the form of a concentrate. In view of this amendment, it is respectfully

requested that this part of the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 11, as amended, be allowed.

In the fifth part of this rejection, the Examiner states:

Claim 13 recites a particular boiling point for a component in the composition. Do Applicants intend that this is the boiling point for the fluorinated solvent?

In response, Applicant has amended claim 13 to show that the boiling point is that of the fluorinated solvent.

In view of this amendment, it is respectfully requested that this part of the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 13, as amended, be allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

On pages 3-4, in numbered paragraph 5, of the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,346,654 (Omure et al.).

On page 3-4, in numbered paragraph 5 (sic), of the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7, 8, 10 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,346,654 (Omure et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,514,301 (Bil et al.).

On pages 6-7, in numbered paragraph 6, of the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 12 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication 05293303 (Asahi Chemical Corp.) in view of U.S. Patent 3,957,672 (Zisman et al.).

In each of these rejections, it is the position of the Examiner that the rejected claims are obvious over the teachings of the cited reference or the combination of the teachings of the cited references.

These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicant has amended claim 1 to specifically recite that the polyfluorinated alcohol is water-immiscible and that the composition does not exhibit a flash point under standard determination conditions (ASTM standard D 3828).

In contrast, Omure et al. teaches only that "the desiccant composition is hardly inflammable or nonflammable and, therefore, advantageous in handling" (column 5, lines 4-6) and Bil et al. teaches only that the "solvent is preferably chosen from nonflammable compounds (column 3, lines 2-3). Neither Japanese Publication 05293303 nor Zisman et al. of U.S. Patent 3,957,672 (Zisman et al.) teaches a composition that does not exhibit a flash point under standard determination conditions (ASTM standard D

MICHAUD -- U.S. PATENT APPLICATION 09/034,415

3828). Thus, none of the cited references teaches a composition that does not exhibit a flash point under standard determination conditions (ASTM standard D 3828).

It follows that amended claim 1 is not obvious over the teachings of the cited reference or the combination of the teachings of the cited references. Claims 2-25 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended claim 1. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn and that claims 1-15 be allowed.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any matters remain in this application which might be resolved by interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (202) 466-6300.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD

By: *Frederick F. Calvetti* 33,543
Frederick F. Calvetti
Reg. No. 28,557

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD
P.O. Box 65331
Washington, DC 20035-5331
Tel: (202) 466-6300
Fax: (202) 463-0678